

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-17 and 19-36 are pending. Claim 2 is canceled in this Response.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 14, 15, 23, 28, 30 and 35 have been amended to correct the informalities noted by the Office at pages 2-3 of the Office Action.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-16, 21 and 22 were rejected under Section 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 1 has been amended, as suggested by the Office, to recite a scanner communicatively coupled to the scan review system. Accordingly, Claim 2 has been canceled. Applicants request, therefore, withdrawal of the Section 101 rejection of Claim 1 and Claims 3, 4 and 6-13 depending from Claim 1.

Claim 14 has been amended to recite "reviewing image data corresponding to scanned pages of the document relative to the selected registration characteristic...." Support for this amendment may be found in the Specification at page 10, lines 11-14 and page 11, line 22 through page 12, line 6. Claim 14 as amended is felt to recite statutory subject matter under Section 101.

Rejections Based on Sturgeon

Claims 23-26 and 30-33 were rejected under Section 102 as being anticipated by Sturgeon (6466336). Claims 1, 3-4, 6-17, 19-22, 27-29 and 34-36 were rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Sturgeon (6466336) in view of Liu (6735335).

The rejections under both Sections 102 and 103 are based on the assertion that Sturgeon teaches determining if a page is properly aligned for scanning by reviewing the scanned page for a selected characteristic. This assertion is not correct.

Sturgeon teaches the use of page designations to: collate pages in a scanned document when the scanning page order is not the same as the desired document page order (column 6, lines 31-34 and column 7, lines 9-13); determine inconsistencies in the orientation of pages in a scanned document (column 6, lines 37-53); and compare the total number of pages scanned with a desired or

anticipated number of pages (column 8, lines 49-52). In Sturgeon, so-called "misfed" pages are identified "by comparing the number of pages actually scanned to a desired or predetermined number." Sturgeon, column 5, lines 54-57.

There is no teaching in the passages in Sturgeon cited by the Office, or anywhere else in Sturgeon, that page designations (or any other page characteristic) are used to determine that a page is or is not properly aligned for scanning. Claim 23, for example, recites reviewing the scanned page for a selected characteristic and, based on the act of reviewing, determining if the scanned page is properly aligned for scanning. (The other independent claims contain similar limitations.) As noted above, Sturgeon does not teach or suggest these limitations. If the Office disagrees, it is respectfully requested to specifically point out and explain those passages in Sturgeon that teach determining if a page is properly *aligned* for scanning by reviewing the scanned page for a page designation or any other selected characteristic. Absent such a showing, the rejections based on Sturgeon should be withdrawn.

Rejections Based on Liu

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-17, 19-22, 27-29 and 34-36 were rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Sturgeon in view of Liu.

The rejections under Section 103 are based on the assertion that Liu teaches a layout attribute analyzer that verifies the size of the margins on a scanned page. This assertion is not correct.

Liu teaches the use of page layout attributes such as page numbers, page headers, page footers, heading and captions, to determine whether or not scanned pages belong to the same document. Liu, column 7, lines 26-30. Liu does not mention a margin or margins – neither term appears in Liu.

There is no teaching in the passages in Liu cited by the Office, or anywhere else in Liu, that a layout attribute analyzer verifies the size of the margins on a scanned page. Claim 14, for example, recites enabling selection of a registration characteristic of a page of the document, wherein the registration characteristic is at least one of: top line, top margin, bottom line, bottom margin, left margin or right margin; reviewing image data corresponding to scanned pages of the document relative to the selected registration characteristic; and based on the act of reviewing, determining if the pages of the document were properly aligned for scanning.

Claims 1, 27 and 34 contain similar limitations. As noted above, Liu does not teach using margins as any kind of registration characteristic. Liu also does not teach using the top line or the bottom line as any kind of registration characteristic. If the Office disagrees, it is respectfully requested to specifically point out and explain those passages in Liu that teach using margins or the top or bottom line as any kind of registration characteristic. Absent such a showing, the rejections based on Liu should be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven R. Ormiston, Reg. No. 35,974